December 12, 1997

ELECTRONIC ONE-STOP INVITATION TO COLLABORATE

TECHNOLOGY & SERVING INDIVIDUALS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS PILOTS

TO: Vendors of Electronic Special Needs Products

FROM: William M. Maguy, Chairman

             One-Stop Career Center System Task Force

SUBJECT: Solicitation For Proposals

California is in the process of implementing a statewide One-Stop Career Center System of local "One-Stop" career centers. At these One-Stop Centers, staff of various State and local agencies are co-located in a single site, and provide services to job, education, and employment training seekers, as well as employers who wish to fill job openings. In many cases, local One-Stops also provide information and services which is accessible to customers at satellite locations and/or remote electronic access points.

The California One-Stop Career Center System Task Force has adopted and published guidelines to promote information accessibility for individuals with special needs. These guidelines are available in hard copy form and are Internet accessible at **www.sjtcc.cahwnet.gov/SJTCCWEB/ONE-STOP**, or from the State One-Stop Office, P.O. Box 826880, MIC 77, Sacramento, CA 94280-0001. Through this Solicitation for Proposals (SFP), the Task Force is seeking to identify four partnerships to "pilot test" these guidelines.

This SFP is in a non-standard format. The attached document provides background and requirements for submittal of a proposal. This SFP requires a joint proposal between a product vendor and a local "One-Stop" entity. It is intended to allow a One-Stop Center to pilot the feasibility of using the published guidelines to meet the needs of the widest possible range of target audiences. This SFP also provides vendors of products designed to provide increased accessibility for individuals with special needs with a highly visible

demonstration of the usefulness of their product. At the end of the six-month pilot period, the experience of the four pilot locations will be evaluated and publicized throughout California's One-Stop Career Center System network, as well as nationally to other states which are developing similar One-Stop Systems with assistance from the U.S. Department of Labor.

1. A list of the administrative contact person for each of the thirteen local entities which have received first-year One-Stop Career Center System grants from the State of California,

2. A list of the Job Training Partnership Act Service Delivery Area (SDA) administrators whom you can contact to obtain information in respect to a number of other "self-identified" local One-Stop Centers located throughout the state, and

3. A list of product vendors to whom this SFP has been sent. This letter and attachments will also be sent to the One-Stop administrative entities noted in #1 and #2, above. Additional vendors are also welcome to partner with local One-Stops, even if the vendors are not on this initial distribution list.

Local One-Stop Center administrative entities as well as product vendors are encouraged to contact each other and to mutually develop and submit a joint proposal. Vendors may submit proposals in conjunction with more than one One-Stop Center administrator.

It is anticipated that proposals will include a list of in-kind products and services to be provided by each party to the proposal. It is not anticipated that proposals will be requesting funding for the six month pilot period. Selection criteria of pilot locations will include the range of special needs served, completeness of pilot implementation and evaluation plan, the availability of a subject test population, and the extensiveness of the proposed pilot. All proposals must be received at the State One-Stop Office in Sacramento by February 15, 1998, at 4:00 p.m. to be considered.

If you have any questions, please contact Robert Marr of the State One-Stop Office at (916) 654-5538, or by e-mail at: bmarr@edd.ca.gov.

AbleNet, Inc.
Ms. Peggy Locke
1081 Tenth Avenue S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55414

Acrontech International, Inc.
Mr. George Priftis
Williamsville Executive Center
5500 Main Street
Williamsville, NY 14221

Adaptivation
Mr. Don Kehoe
224 S.E. 16th Street, Suite 2
Ames, IA 50010

Adaptive Computer Systems, Inc.
Mr. Glen A. Meyers
1835 Hafor Street
Iowa City, IA 52246

Ai Squared
Mr. Scott Moore
P.O. Box 669
Manchester Center, VT 05255-0669

Alliance For Technology Access
Mr. Russ Holland
2175 E. Francisco Blvd., Suite L
San Rafael, CA 94901

ALVA Access Group, Inc.
Ms. Angelika Angermann
2095 Rose Street
Suite 9, Box 7
Berkeley, CA 94709

American Foundation For The Blind
Mr. Mark Uslan
11 Penn Plaza, Suite 300
New York, NY 10001

American Thermoform Corporation
Ms. Ruth Haggen
2311 Travers Avenue
City of Commerce, CA 90040

American Thermoform Corporation
2311 Travers Avenue
City of Commerece, CA 90040

Arkenstone, Inc.
Mr. Jim Fruchterman
555 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94086

Arkenstone, Inc.
505 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA   94089

Artic Technologies International
Mr. Dale McDaniel
55 Park Street, Suite 2
Troy, MI 48083

Articulate Systems, Inc.
600 West Cummings Park, Suite 4500
Woburn, MA 01801

Attainment Company, Inc.
Ms. Sue Lockard
P.O. Box 930160
504 Commerce Pky
Verona, WI

Attention Control Systems
Mr. Richard Levinson
650 Castro St., Suite 120-197
Mountain View, CA 94041

Automated Functions, Inc.
Ms. Mary Landon
7115 Leesburg Pike, Suite 312
Arlington, VA 22043

Baum
Ms. Traci Deguchi
c/o TeleSensory Systems, Inc.
P.O. Box 7455
Mountain View, CA 94043

Blazie Engineering
Mr. Bryan J. Blazie
105 E. Jarrettsville Road
Forest Hill, MD 21050

Careerware
Mr. Van M. Woolley
21 Baja Court
Sacramento, CA 95831

Celexx Trading Co., Inc.
Mr.. Harold Abraham
2535 Seminole
Detroit, MI 48214

Claris Corporation
5201 Patrick Henry Dr., C-56
Box 58168
Santa Clara, CA 95052-8168

Common Cents System
Mr. Rob Ringenberg
P.O. Box 110514
Nashville, TN 37222

Communication Devices, Inc.
Ms. Jill Monroe
2433 Government Way, Suite A
Coeur D'Alene, ID 83814

Companion Products International
Mr. Robert Langstroth
P.O. Box G
Milford, PA 18337-0208

Computer Talk
Robin Springer
22645 Ventura Blvd., Suite 255
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Deaf & Disabled Telecom Program
Ms. Sharon Shafran
1939 Harrison St., Suite 520
Oakland, CA 94612

Dolphin Systems Limited
Ms. Jane Churchward
P.O. Box 83
Worcester WR3 8TU, England

Duxbury Systems, Inc.
Mr. Matt Sullivan
P.O. Box 1504
Littleton, MA 01460

Echo Speech Corporation
6460 Via Real
Carpinteria, CA 93013

Edmark Corporation
Ms. Margaret Tolleshang
P.O. Box 97021
Redmond, WA 98073-9721

Educational Press/Learning Well
1720 H Bellmont Avenue
Baltimore, MD 21224

Enabling Technologies Co.
Ms. Jill Enderle
3102 S.E. Jay Street
Stuart, FL 34997

Enhanced Vision Systems, Inc.
Kamran Siminou
2915 Red Hill Avenue
Building B-201
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Entex Information Services, Inc.
Mr. Will Molina
U.S. Bank Plaza Building
980 9th St., Suite 380
Sacramento, CA 95814

ENTEX Information Services, Inc.
Mr. Will Molina
U.S. Bank Plaza Building
980 9th Street, Suite 380
Sacramento, CA 95814

EyeTech Digital Systems
Ms. Melinda Trego
1750 E. McLellan Road
Mesa, AZ 85203

Federal Laboratory Consortium
Dr. Andrew Cowan
P.O. Box 545
Sequim, WA 98382

First Byte
Ms. Diane Sagerian
19840 Pioneer Avenue
Torrance, CA 90503

G W Micro, Inc.
Mr. Douglas H. Geoffray
725 Airport North Office Park
Fort Wayne, IN 46825

Great Talking Box Company
Mr. David Joseph
2211 Fortune Dr., Suite B
San Jose, CA 95131

Gus Communications
Mr. Gordon Harris
1006 Lonetree Court
Bellingham, WA 98226

H. K. Eyecan, Ltd.
Gail Snuggs
36 Burland Street
Ottawa, Ontario, K2B 6J8 Canada

Hartley Courseware, Inc.
9920 Pacific Heights Blvd., Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92121

Health Care Resources
Mr. Kevin Catlin
1444 Aviation Blvd., Suite 103
Redondo Beach, CA   90278

Hearit Company
Lorin W. Surpless
8346 North Mammoth Drive
Tucson, AZ 85743

Henter-Joyce, Inc.
Mr. Eric S. Damery
2100 62nd Avenue North
St. Petersburg, FL 33702

HumanWare
Mr. Fred Grimes
6245 King Road
Loomis, CA 95650

In Touch Systems
11 Westview Road
Spring Valley, NY 10977

Industry Canada
Ms. Mary Frances Laughton
3701 Carling Ave.
P.O. Box 11490
St. H, Ottawa, Ontario K2H 8S2 Canada

Infra-Link, Inc.
Mr. Larry Weiss
P.O. Box 1008
Portland, OR 97207-1008

Innocomp
Jeri Lynn Hoffman
26210 Emery Road, Suite 302
Warrensville Heights, OH 44128

Innoventions, Inc.
Mr. Tom Winter
5921 South Middlefield Rd., Suite 102
Littleton, CO 80123-2877

Instructional Technology, Inc.
Ms. Linda L. White
P.O. Box 2056
Easton, MD 21601

Intelligent Peripheral Devices, Inc.
Ms. Carmen Saura
20380 Town Center Lane, Suite 270
Cupertino, CA 95014

IntelliTools
55 Leveroni Ct., Suite 9
Novato, CA 94949

IntelliTools, Inc.
Ms. Joan Cunningham
55 Leveroni Court, Suite 9
Novato, CA 94949

JBliss Imaging Systems
Mr. James C. Bliss
P.O. Box 1746
Los Altos, CA 94023-1746

Jet Propulsion Laboratory
Mr. Alfred W. Pappano
4800 Oak Grove Drive, MS 301-350
Pasadena, CA 91109-8099

Judy Lynn Software
Mr. Elliot Pludwinski
278 Dunhams Corner Road
East Brunswick, NJ 08816

Language Systems, Inc.
Mr. John Fought
6269 Variel Ave., Suite F
Woodland Hills, Ca 91367

Laureate Learning Systems, Inc.
Ms. Mary Wilson
110 East Spring St.
Winooski, VT 05404

Madenta Communications
9411A - 20 Ave.
Edmonton AB, Canada T6N 1E5

Madenta Communications, Inc.
Mr. Mike Kluttig
9411-A 20th Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta, T6N 1E5 CANADA

Mainstream Magazine
Ms. Cyndi Jones
2973 Beech Street
San Diego, CA 902102

Mayer-Johnson Co.
Mr. Mike Petruzzelle
P.O. Box 1579
Solana Beach, CA   92075-1579

Mayer-Johnson Co.
P.O. Box 1579
Solana Beach, CA 92075

Microsoft - Accessibility and Disabilities
Group
One Microsoft Way
Redman, WA   98052-6399

Microsoft Corporation
Mr. Gary Moulton
1 Microsoft Way
Redmond, WA 98052-6399

Microsystems Software, Inc.
Mr. Bill Kilroy
600 Worcester Road
Framingham, MA 01701

National Federation of the Blind
Mr. Jim Gashel
1800 Johnson Street
Baltimore, MD 21230

Okay Vision-Aide Corp.
Mr. John Delaney
14811 Myford Road
Tustin, CA 92680

Origin Instruments Corporation
Mr. Melfin Dashner
854 Greenview Drive
Grand Prairie, TX 75050-2438

Pacific Bell
Jodie Tyo
8401 Page Street, Suite 105
Buena Park, CA 90621

Pulse Data Internationa, Inc.
Mr. Michael R. Patterson
2860 W. Ina Road, Suite 108
Tuscon, AZ

Quartet Technology, Inc.
Mr. Scott Hamer
11 School Street
No. Chelmsford, MA 01863

R. J. Cooper & Associates
R. J. Cooper
24843 Del Prado, Suite 283
Dana Point, CA 92629

R. J. Cooper and Associates
24843 Del Prado, #283
Dana Pt., CA 92629

Raised Dot Computing, Inc.
Ms. Susan Haldiman
408 South Baldwin St.
Madison, WI 53703

Rancho Los Amigos Medical Center
Ms. Molly Doyle
Ctr. F/Applied Rehab. Technology
7601 E. Imperial Hwy.
Downey, CA 90242

Rapid Text
Ms. Glory Johnson
230 Newport Center Dr., Suite 250
Newport Beach, CA   92660-7510

Repro Tronics, Inc.
Mr. Dave Skrivanek
75 Carter Avenue
Westwood, NJ 07675

Rhamdec, Inc.
1900 Wyatt Drive, Suite 12
Santa Clara, CA 95054

Roger Wagner Publishing, Inc.
1050 Pioneer Way, #P
El Cajon, CA 92020

Sacramento County Office of Education
Mr. John Fleischman
Outreach and Technical Assistance
Network
9738 Lincoln Village Drive
Sacramento, CA 95827-3399

SEMERC
Mr. Vorn Handcock
1 Broadbent Road
Watersheddings, Oldham OL1 4LB
UNITED KINGDOM,

Shared Techologies & Information
Mr. Jay L. Lichenstein
1620 West Oakland Park Blvd.
Suite 403
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33311-1506

Slater Software
Mr. James E. Slater
351 Badger Lane
Guffey, CO 80820

Synapse
Mr. Martin Tibur
3095 Kerner St., Suite S
San Rafael, CA 94901

Synergy
Dawn Russell
412 High Plain Street, #19
Walpole, MA 02081-4263

Syntha-Voice Computers, Inc.
Laszlo Horvath
304-800 Queenston Road
Stoney Creek, Ont. L8G 1A1 CANADA

T.F.I. Engineers & Myna Corporation
Hesham Elmassry
529 Main Street
Boxton, MA 02129

Talk Technology
Mr. Vincent B. O'Hara
6224 Viewpoint Drive
San Diego, CA 92139-2351

Tech For The Visually Impaired, Inc.
Mr. John Panarese
9 Nolan Court
Hauppague, NY 11778

TeleSensory
Mr. Marc Stenzel
P.O. Box 7455
Mountain View, CA 94043

TeleSensory Systems, Inc.
Jackie Wheeler
P.O. Box 7455
Mountain View, CA 94043

TouchMedia
Ms. Maryanne M. Torrence
3176 Pullman Street, Suite 110
Costa Mesa, CA   92626

Trace R & D Center
Ms. Rachel Bower
S-151 Waisman Center
1500 Highland Avenue
Madison, WI 53705

Universal Learning Technologies
Carol Vallone
39 Cross Street
Peabody, MA 01960

Vision Technology, Inc.
Mr. Daniel Meyer
40 Worthington Drive
Maryland Heights, MO 63043

Visionics Corporation
Mr. Ronald De Long
1000 Boone Ave. North, Ste. 600
Minneapolis, MN 55427

WesTest Engineering Corp.
Ms. Mary Lynds
1470 North Main Street
Bountiful, UT 84010

Words +, Inc.
Mr. Phil Lawrence
40015 Sierra Highway, Bldg. B-145
Palmdale, CA 93591

World Communications
245 Tonopah Drive
Fremont, CA 94539

SPR

SOCIAL POLICY RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

WORKING PAPER:
ACCOUNTABILITY ISSUES
FOR ONE-STOP SYSTEMS

October 20, 1997

Prepared by:

Deborah Kogan

Prepared for:

One-Stop Career Center System Task Force
Office of Workforce Policy
P.O. Box 826880, MIC 77
Sacramento, CA 94280-0001

ACCOUNTABILITY ISSUES FOR ONE-STOP SYSTEMS

INTRODUCTION

One of the four federal goals of the One-Stop initiative is to make One-Stop systems "outcome-driven." This has been interpreted by most One-Stop states as requiring workforce development systems to pay attention to *customer outcomes*, including:

- Measures of employment, earnings, and skill enhancements achieved by individual One-Stop customers.

- Measures of job-seeker satisfaction with services and service outcomes.

- Measures of whether employers using One-Stop services have located and hired new workers as a result

- Measures of employer satisfaction with services and service outcomes.

Process measures can play important roles in an outcome-driven system. However, within outcome-driven systems, process measures should be justified because of their usefulness in explaining how and why desired customer outcomes occurred (or failed to occur), rather than because of any a priori validity.

Another common understanding about the goals of One-Stop accountability is that outcome-driven systems should use information about outcomes to identify needed system changes through a *continuous improvement process* involving feedback, analysis, and system refinement.

The purpose of this working paper is to provide a framework for California One-Stop planners and practitioners to use in planning how information about One-Stop processes and outcomes should be used to ensure One-Stop accountability and enhance system improvements through the distinct, but related, processes of (1) certification;
(2) performance management; and (3) impact evaluation.

CERTIFICATION

One-Stop implementation states have used certification and chartering processes to support the start-up of One-Stop systems and to promote local design and implementation plans that are consistent with statewide goals. Certification procedures have been used to accomplish a number of different operational objectives, including:

- *Selecting local systems to receive One-Stop implementation grants.* Ensuring that local One-Stop systems (or individual centers) have an appropriate One-Stop design and implementation plan before they can receive approval for projects funded with One-Stop implementation grant funds.

- *Certifying local One-Stop policy boards.* Ensuring that One-Stop governance structures meet the criteria necessary to guide local One-Stop systems and carry out other administrative functions delegated to the local level.

- *Certifying One-Stop centers as ready for operation.* Ensuring that that local One-Stop centers meet a minimum set of One-Stop design and operational criteria (usually process measures) before they can use the name and logo associated with the state's "One-Stop career center" system in advertising their services to the public.

- *Ensuring that One-Stop centers are continuing to meet basic operational and outcome criteria over time.* Designing ongoing One-Stop operational criteria and/or performance goals that can be used to assess adherence to basic One-Stop design, service, and outcome criteria over time.

During 1996, SPR reviewed the criteria used by 12 different first and second round implementation grant states to certify local centers, systems, or boards, or charter One-Stop center operators. The certification requirements established by different states are intended to shape local One-Stop systems in certain ways to ensure that the DOL concepts of universality, customer choices, integration of services, and outcome-driven systems were realized. In developing certification standards, states usually try to ensure a certain amount of statewide consistency in the scope and quality of services offered. To a greater or lesser degree, states are also interested in influencing how services are offered. Although some states are more prescriptive than others, all states recognize the need to let local areas develop One-Stop service systems that are responsive to local conditions.

In most states, the authority for certifying local One-Stop systems or centers is retained at the state level. Several states (e.g., Massachusetts and North Carolina) delegated the authority to charter or certify local centers to local workforce boards. Texas "certifies" local workforce development boards, which then have substantial discretion to select local service providers and guide the design and delivery of One-Stop services.

During the first year of One-Stop implementation, certification criteria consisted largely of qualitative process measures describing requirements for One-Stop organization and structure, partners, services, physical facilities, and technology linkages. However, a number of states anticipate introducing

3

performance measures into their certification/chartering processes. At least initially, most states have required that One-Stop centers collect information on agreed-upon outcome measures—including customer satisfaction—and work on collecting information and basing continuous improvement efforts on measures identified by the state as part of its emerging One-Stop accountability system. As One-Stop systems mature, the need for centers to be "recertified" will emerge. For a number of states, recertification may be contingent upon the documented achievement of selected performance goals.

ONE-STOP PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT SYSTEMS

Performance measurement systems are designed to answer questions important to system managers, including how local One-Stop system performance compares to performance goals, previous performance at a given site, and performance in other sites. The overall purpose of performance measurement systems is to provide a framework of measures that can be used to support some or all of the following operational objectives:

- Documenting "baseline" operational systems and customer outcomes at the beginning of One-Stop system transformation.

- Tracking changes in overall state and local performance over time.

- Setting goals that identify desired performance improvements and/or absolute performance levels.

- Identifying and rewarding sites with high performance.

- Analyzing how to support and replicate high performance levels in other performance areas and in other sites.

- Promoting continuous improvement by identifying areas of low performance and supporting the development of strategies to improve performance in these areas.

Rather than impose a standardized federal framework for the measurement of One-Stop system performance, the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) has encouraged each One-Stop implementation state to identify its own performance measures based on the state's One-Stop system transformation goals. In addition, a federal interagency Workforce Development Performance Measures Policy Committee is working to promote the coherence and comparability of One-Stop performance measures by supporting the development of a shared "menu of measures."

Some states have chosen to design comprehensive workforce development performance measurement systems whose overall goals provide an "umbrella" for and encompass the performance goals and measures of a number of individual categorical programs. Other states are choosing to

develop narrower One-Stop performance measurement systems whose goals and measures supplement the goals of individual categorical programs.

Performance measurement systems may examine a number of different aspects of One-Stop system performance, including:

- *Visibility, market penetration, and utilization rates.*

- *Equity of access* measures that address goals for serving specific customer subpopulations.

- *Process measures* that assess progress in implementation qualitative aspects of One-Stop organizational, service design, and service delivery goals.

- *Outcome measures*, as described on the first page of this working paper.

- *Cost-efficiency and cost-effectiveness measures* that assess whether customer outcomes are achieved in a cost efficient way.

In its application to DOL for a state One-Stop implementation grant, California indicated that it would use five clusters of measures to assess One-Stop system accomplishments. The exhibit below summarizes how these proposed outcome measures compare to the possible areas of One-Stop performance measurement.

Potential One-Stop Performance Measures	Proposed California Measures
Visibility, market penetration, and utilization rates	
Equity of access measures	• The extent to which diverse populations are able to access and receive services, in relation to their representation in the local population.
Process Measures	
Customer Outcome Measures	• Employment outcome measures. • Learning outcomes measures. • Customer satisfaction measures.
Cost Effectiveness/Efficiency Measures	• A measure or measures for statewide return on investment that considers reduced public expenditure for social programs.

One-Stop performance measurement systems can be used to provide information about a wide range of accomplishments for use by a variety of system stakeholders. Among the different *perspectives* from which One-Stop performance can be viewed are the following:

- Measures of *overall system performance*, including the extent that potential employer and job-seeker customers are aware of and use the One-Stop system, overall customer outcomes, and the overall level of satisfaction of current customers.

- Measures of *the effectiveness of different services within the One-Stop system*, such as self-access services, guided or group services, and intensive services, such as education and training services.

- Measures of *how the system is performing for customer groups with different employment objectives*, such as employers versus job-seekers; and students versus job-seekers versus employed workers.

- Measures of *how the system is performing for individuals likely to need more intensive or specialized services*, such as individuals with limited basic skills or limited English, individuals with disabilities, or individuals making the transition from welfare to work.

First steps in developing a performance measurement system include: (1) deciding what functions the performance measurement system is intended to support; (2) selecting performance measures that reflect state One-Stop system objectives; (3) identifying the universe and subgroups to which each performance measure should be applied; (4) determining how to collect consistent information on performance for all intended subgroups at reasonable cost; and (5) planning for use of information on performance measures as inputs into continuous improvement efforts.

Subsequent steps include: (6) measuring baseline performance on selected measures; (7) setting state and local performance objectives; (8) training managers on how to use performance information on an ongoing basis (e.g., whether and how to reward high-performing systems or identify strategies for improving problematic performance); and (9) adding data elements, as needed, over time to support performance analysis and system management.

During the early stages of One-Stop implementation, a number of states and local sites have emphasized the use of process measures and customer satisfaction measures to supplement existing outcome measures required for specific categorical programs.

To foster use of performance measures to support program improvement efforts, states and local areas have also emphasized training managers and direct service staff on how to use performance information to identify problem areas, diagnose why problems occurred, set measurable goals for improvement, and monitor whether system refinements have had the intended effect of improving measured performance in the targeted areas. It may also be important to monitor whether any unintended effects have occurred as a result of system changes.

Among the most difficult challenges of developing One-Stop performance measurement systems are:

- Deciding which customer outcome measures should apply to different groups within the universe of potential and actual One-Stop customers (depending, for example, on employment objectives and intensity of services received).

- Developing integrated data systems with consistent definitions and comparable data across different funding streams.

- Collecting information about the utilization of self-access services and identifying how this important category of services influences customer satisfaction and customer outcomes.

EVALUATING THE ONE-STOP SYSTEM TRANSFORMATION

The One-Stop initiative is based on the assumption that a system that realizes the features described in One-Stop certification and performance measurement systems—such as interagency planning and integrated service delivery—will have improved customer outcomes compared to workforce development systems that do not follow the One-Stop model, all other conditions being equal.

Evaluations of One-Stop system transformation address several questions, as follows:

- *Implementation evaluations* address questions about how the transformed system differs from the previous system, what challenges were encountered during the planning and implementation process and how these challenges were overcome.

- *Process evaluations* address questions about how One-Stop systems vary in their organization, governance, service design and delivery features, and how different agencies collaborate in the design and delivery of One-Stop services.

- *Impact evaluations* address questions about how One-Stop system outcomes differ from the outcomes that would have occurred under a less integrated workforce development system.

Both process and impact evaluations of One-Stop system transformation need to pay attention to process measures. Process evaluations address how and why different One-Stop systems develop differing organization and governance features and how these features influence One-Stop service design and delivery. Impact evaluations document variations in the key features of One-Stop system design and level of system maturity across the sites implementing One-Stop approaches and use these measures to analyze differences in outcomes across sites with different features.

To assess the impacts of One-Stop systems, evaluations also need to collect and analyze information about system outcomes. To make internally valid comparisons of the impact of One-Stop implementation within a given site, comparable outcome data have to be collected for the period prior to One-Stop implementation and the One-Stop period. It may also be necessary to adjust for variations in customer characteristics or local labor market features over time using multivariate analysis techniques.

Thus, to implement a cross-site evaluation of the impact of One-Stop system transformation in the different sites receiving implementation grants, California could collect and compare information about workforce development system outcomes in One-Stop project sites before and after the implementation of One-Stop systems. In addition, the state could compare the pre-post differences in workforce development system outcomes between sites with more fully-developed and less-developed One-Stop systems.

As a result of their rigorous research requirements and expense, implementation, process, and impact evaluations are likely to be performed for a specific evaluation period rather than on an ongoing basis. In contrast, performance measurement systems are intended to provide ongoing information about system outcomes for use by program managers. Despite their significant cost, however, periodic impact evaluations provide a useful check on what the causal relationships are between workforce development system design features, implementation practices, and improved customer outcomes.

ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION AND PLANNING REGARDING ONE-STOP SYSTEM ACCOUNTABILITY IN CALIFORNIA

- Planning for local discretion within a standardized statewide accountability framework.

- Identifying state and local operational objectives for certification and performance measurement procedures.

- Assigning state and local certification and performance measurement roles and responsibilities.

- Designing an evolving certification and performance measurement system: first steps versus long-term plans.

- Training managers to use accountability measures to support continuous improvement efforts.

- Identifying state and local One-Stop evaluation objectives.